



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/303,356

04/29/1999

DAVID W. BACHMANN

AT9-98-955

8249

7590

02/11/2005

LAW OFFICES OF  
JOSEPH R. BURWELL  
P.O. BOX 28022  
AUSTIN, TX 78755-8022

EXAMINER

TO, BAOQUOC N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2162

DATE MAILED: 02/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/303,356

Applicant(s)

BACHMANN ET AL.

Examiner

Baoquoc N To

Art Unit

2162

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12/07/2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-20 are pending in this application.

***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 9, 14, 16 and 19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 1 is rejected because as broadly as interpretation the method of claim 1 which does not require a computer system to perform the recited steps. A person in skill in the art can perform this method on papers.

Claims 2-8 are depended on claim 1; therefore, they are rejected under the same reason.

Claim 9 is rejected under 101 because as broadly as the claim can be interprets the method of claim 9 does not require a computer system to perform the recited steps. A person in skill in the art can perform the method on paper.

Claims 10-13 are depended on claim 9; therefore, they are rejected under the same reason.

Claim 14 is rejected under 101 because as broadly as the claim can be interpreted, the method recited in claim does not require a computer system to perform the recited steps. A person in skill of the art can perform the recited method on papers.

Claim 15 is depended on claim 14; therefore, they are rejected under the same reason.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-3, 7-8 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peters et al. (US. Patent No. 6,377,950 B1) in view of Gallant (US. Patent No. 4,648,036).

Regarding on claims 1 and 16, Peters teaches the method for deleting entries from a directory in which directory information is stored in a set of database tables, comprising the step:

Receiving a request to delete a directory entry (selecting the entry which the delete will be performed on) (col. 8, line 60);

Responsive to receiving the request to delete a directory entry, determining to tag the directory entry for subsequent deletion by setting an attribute of the directory entry to a predetermined value (delete the entry on the DS 118 (or uncheck the IDS-Managed checkbox) (col. 8, lines 61-62);

Updating a first database table storing the attribute of the directory entry (the IDS system finds the deleted entry on the DS 118 and marks the corresponding entry on OPS Manager 116 for deletion) (col. 8, lines 64-66);

Periodically searching for tagged directory entries in the first database table during a cleanup process interval (during its next Deletion Discovery event, the IDS system finds the deleted entry on the IDS 118 and marks the corresponding entry on OPS Manager 116 for deletion) (col. 8, lines 63-66); and

Deleting references to the tagged directory entries throughout the set of database tables (the delete then proceeds through the MAC mechanism in the usual manner) (col. 8, lines 66-67).

Peters does not explicitly teach determining to tag the directory entry for subsequent deletion by setting an attribute of the directory entry to a predetermine value. On the other hand, Gallant teaches "fig. 5 shows the pertinent data states of tables 1, 10 and 20 after being processed as described above. Specially, note that the delete and insert commands for table 1, as shown in the update transaction of fig. 3, are reflected by two records (2) 1, 3 and (2) 1, 2 now in table 1. The record (2) 1, 3 is marked for deletion by a code field value 1" (col. 5, lines 51-58). This suggests the value of the transaction or in another word entries are marked with a value of 1 for deletion. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Peters' system to include making transactions with code field value of 1 for deletion as taught by Gallant in order to provide dynamic deleting process for time saving.

Regarding on claim 2, Peters does not explicitly teach the directory entries is tagged by setting its creation time attribute to a given value. On the other hand, Gallant teaches "fig. 5 shows the pertinent data states of tables 1, 10 and 20 after being processed as described above. Specially, note that the delete and insert commands for table 1, as shown in the update transaction of fig. 3, are reflected by two records (2) 1, 3 and (2) 1, 2 now in table 1. The record (2) 1, 3 is marked for deletion by a code field value 1" (col. 5, lines 51-58). This suggests the value of the transaction or in another word entries are of the attributes marked with a value of 1 for deletion. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Peters' system to include making transactions with code field value of 1 for deletion as taught by Gallant in order to provide dynamic deleting process for time saving.

Regarding on claim 3, Peters does not explicitly teach the given value is a null value. On the other hand, Gallant teaches "fig. 5 shows the pertinent data states of tables 1, 10 and 20 after being processed as described above. Specially, note that the delete and insert commands for table 1, as shown in the update transaction of fig. 3, are reflected by two records (2) 1, 3 and (2) 1, 2 now in table 1. The record (2) 1, 3 is marked for deletion by a code field value 1" (col. 5, lines 51-58). This suggests the same concept of setting 1 or 0 for deletion. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Peters' system to include making transactions with code field value of 1 or 0 for deletion as taught by Gallant in order to provide dynamic deleting process for time saving.

Regarding on claim 7, Peters teaches the method recited in claim 1 where in the first database table is an entry table (entries of the OPS Manager table 116) (col. 7, lines 15-17).

Regarding on claim 8, Peters teaches the method recited in claim 7 wherein the set of database tables includes at least one attribute table storing information about an attribute (col. 7, lines 15-17).

5. Claims 4, 9-13 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peters et al. (US. Patent No. 6,377,950 B1) in view of Gallant (US. Patent No. 4,648,036) and further in view of Lee et al. (Pub. No. US 2001/0054031 A).

Claim 9 is rejected under the same reason as claim 1, in addition to “excluding tagged directory entries from search results that otherwise satisfy the search query” is not disclosed by either Peters or Gallant. However, Lee discloses “based on sample data collected in the AICC system 100, the ALS Manager UI will estimate the number of tag records to be retrieved from the Tag Database within one 24-hour period due to new learning acquisition criteria, such as SQL queries. This simulation will allow the user to look at individual tag records that would be include or excluded as a result of record changes” (page 8, paragraph 0162). This suggests concept of retrieving the search results however excluding those are tagged. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Peters’ system to include the search results excluding the tagged records as taught by Lee in order to provide a system to retrieve only wanted results.

Regarding on claim 10, Peters does not explicitly teach the directory entries is tagged by setting its creation time attribute to a given value. On the other hand, Gallant teaches "fig. 5 shows the pertinent data states of tables 1, 10 and 20 after being processed as described above. Specially, note that the delete and insert commands for table 1, as shown in the update transaction of fig. 3, are reflected by two records (2) 1, 3 and (2) 1, 2 now in table 1. The record (2) 1, 3 is marked for deletion by a code field value 1" (col. 5, lines 51-58). This suggests the value of the transaction or in another word entries are of the attributes marked with a value of 1 for deletion. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Peters' system to include making transactions with code field value of 1 for deletion as taught by Gallant in order to provide dynamic deleting process for time saving.

Regarding on claim 11, Peters does not explicitly teach the given value is a null value. On the other hand, Gallant teaches "fig. 5 shows the pertinent data states of tables 1, 10 and 20 after being processed as described above. Specially, note that the delete and insert commands for table 1, as shown in the update transaction of fig. 3, are reflected by two records (2) 1, 3 and (2) 1, 2 now in table 1. The record (2) 1, 3 is marked for deletion by a code field value 1" (col. 5, lines 51-58). This suggests the same concept of setting 1 or 0 for deletion. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Peters' system to include making transactions with code field value of 1 or 0 for deletion as taught by Gallant in order to provide dynamic deleting process for time saving.



Regarding on claim 12, Peters teaches the method recited in claim 1 where in the first database table is an entry table (entries of the OPS Manager table 116) (col. 7, lines 15-17).

Regarding on claim 13, Peters teaches the method recited in claim 7 wherein the set of database tables includes at least one attribute table storing information about an attribute (col. 7, lines 15-17).

Claim 19 is rejected under the same reason as to claim 9, in addition Peters also discloses: a directory organized as a naming hierarchy having a plurality of entries each represented by a unique identifier (col. 3, lines 14-17); a relational database management system having a backing store for storing directory data in a set of database entries (DS 118) (col. 7, lines 15-17); and means for deleting entries from the directory (col. 8, lines 60-67).

Regarding on claim 20, Peters teaches the directory service recited in claim 19 wherein the directory entries is compliant with the Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) (col. 3, lines 38-41).

Regarding on claim 4, Peters teaches performing a search for directory entries that satisfy a search query (col. 5, lines 5-10). However, Peters does not explicitly teach excluding tagged directory entries from search results that otherwise satisfy the search query. On the other hand, Lee discloses "based on sample data collected in the AICC system 100, the ALS Manager UI will estimate the number of tag records to be retrieved from the Tag Database within one 24-hour period due to new learning acquisition criteria, such as SQL queries. This simulation will allow the user to look at

Art Unit: 2162

individual tag records that would be include or excluded as a result of record changes” (page 8, paragraph 0162). This suggests concept of retrieving the search results however excluding those are tagged. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Peters’ system to include the search results excluding the tagged records as taught by Lee in order to retrieve only wanted results.

Regarding on claim 17, Peters does not explicitly teach a means responsive to a search for directory entries that satisfy a search query for excluding tagged entries from search results that otherwise satisfy the search query. On the other hand, Lee discloses “based on sample data collected in the AICC system 100, the ALS Manager UI will estimate the number of tag records to be retrieved from the Tag Database within one 24-hour period due to new learning acquisition criteria, such as SQL queries. This simulation will allow the user to look at individual tag records that would be include or excluded as a result of record changes” (page 8, paragraph 0162). This suggests concept of retrieving the search results however excluding those are tagged. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Peters’ system to include the search results excluding the tagged records as taught by Lee in order to retrieve only wanted results.

Regarding on claim 18, Peters teaches the computer program product in claim 17, wherein the search query is a Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) directory service query (col. 3, lines 38-41)

Art Unit: 2162

6. Claims 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Lee et al. (Pub. No. US2001/0054031 A1) in view of Gallant (US. Patent No. 4,648,036).

Regarding on claim 14, Lee teaches a method for searching a database from a directory service, comprising the steps of;

Receiving a search query (SQL queries) (page 8, paragraph 0162)

Responsive to a search for directory entries that satisfy the search query, excluding given directory entries from the search result that otherwise satisfy the search query (page 8, paragraph 0162); and

Returning the search results (page 8, paragraph 0162).

However, Lee does not explicitly teaches wherein a given directory entry is a directory entry that has been tagged for deletion by setting an attribute of the given directory entry to a predetermined value. On the other hand, Gallant teaches "fig. 5 shows the pertinent data states of tables 1, 10 and 20 after being processed as described above. Specially, note that the delete and insert commands for table 1, as shown in the update transaction of fig. 3, are reflected by two records (2) 1, 3 and (2) 1, 2 now in table 1. The record (2) 1, 3 is marked for deletion by a code field value 1" (col. 5, lines 51-58). This suggests the value of the transaction or in another word entries are marked with a value of 1 for deletion. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Peters' system to include making transactions with code field value of 1 for deletion as taught by Gallant in order to provide dynamic deleting process for time saving.

Regarding on claim 15, Lee teaches the method recited in claim 14 wherein the directory service is a Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) directory service and the database tables are managed by a relational database management service (page 8, paragraph 0162).

7. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peters et al. (US. Patent No. 6,377,950 B1) in view of Gallant (US. Patent No. 4,648,036) and further in view Judd et al. (US. Patent No. 6,360,215 B1).

Regarding on claim 5, both Peters and Gallant do not teach excluding tagged directory entries includes modifying an SQL query to exclude rows having a null change creation. Judd teaches “a search query is submitted to the search engine. The search query is automatically modified to add a reference to the tag word, such as a query term that will exclude any index entry for a document associated with the tag word” (abstract, lines 14-18). This suggests the concept excluding the tagged records. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Peters’ system to include the modifying the query to exclude the tagged records as taught by Judd in order to retrieve only wanted results.

### ***Conclusion***

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Baoquoc N. To whose telephone number is at 571-272-4041 or via e-mail BaoquocN.To@uspto.gov. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday: 8:00 AM – 4:30 PM, EST.

Art Unit: 2162

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached at 571-272-4107.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks


Washington, D.C. 20231.

The fax numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follow:

(703) 872-9306 [Official Communication]

Baoquoc N. To

Feb 2rd, 2005

  
JEAN P. CORRIELLUS  
PRIMARY EXAMINER